arXiv:math/0610084v2 [math.QA] 11 Oct 2007

FERMIONIC FORMS AND QUIVER VARIETIES

SERGEY MOZGOVOY

Abstract. We prove a formula relating the fermionic forms and the Poincaré polynomials of quiver varieties associated to a finite quiver. Applied to quivers of type ADE, our result implies a version of the fermionic Lusztig conjecture.

1. Introduction

Let (Γ, I) be a finite quiver without loops, C be the corresponding generalized Cartan matrix, $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}(\Gamma)$ be the corresponding Kac-Moody algebra and $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ be its Cartan subalgebra, see [20]. Let $(\alpha_i)_{i\in I}$ be simple roots of $\mathfrak{g}$, Q be the root lattice of $\mathfrak{g}$, and P be the weight lattice of $\mathfrak{g}$. For any root vector $\alpha \in Q$, we define $(\alpha^i)_{i\in I} \in \mathbb{Z}^I$ by $\alpha = \sum_{i\in I} \alpha^i \alpha_i$. We will usually identify Q with $\mathbb{Z}^I$ in this way. For any weight vector $\nu \in P$, we define $(\nu_i)_{i\in I} \in \mathbb{Z}^I$ by $\nu_i := (\nu, \alpha_i)$, where $(-,-)$ is a standard non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form on $\mathfrak{h}^\vee$ (see [20, Section 2.1]). It will be always clear from the context if the root vector is considered as a weight vector so that there will be no confusion with the above notation. For any $\nu \in P$ and $\alpha \in Q$, we have $(\nu, \alpha) = \sum_{i\in I} \nu_i \alpha^i$. We define the $\mathbb{Z}$-valued quadratic form T (called the Tits form) on the root lattice Q by $T(\alpha) := \frac{1}{2}(\alpha, \alpha)$, $\alpha \in Q$. For any $\nu \in P$ and $\alpha \in Q_+$, denote

$$[\nu, \alpha] = \prod_{i\in I} [\nu_i, \alpha^i], \qquad [\infty, \alpha] = \prod_{i\in I} [\infty, \alpha^i],$$

where the q-binomial coefficients $[n, m]$ (respectively, $[\infty, m]$), for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, are defined in Section 2. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of partitions. For any $\tau = (\tau^i)_{i\in I} \in \mathcal{P}^I$, we define $\tau_k := (\tau^i_k)_{i\in I} \in \mathbb{N}^I$, $k \geq 1$ and $|\tau| := \sum_{k\geq 1} \tau_k$. We will usually consider τ_k as elements of Q_+ (by identification of Q with $\mathbb{Z}^I$).

The fermionic forms $m(\nu, \lambda, q) \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$ are usually attached to $\nu = (\nu^{(k)} \in P_+)_{k\geq 1}$ and $\lambda \in P_+$ (see [14, Section 4], [13, Section 4.2]). In this paper we will assume that $\nu^{(k)} = 0$ for $k > 1$ and thus ν will be considered as an element of P. The relation of the definition below to the usual definition of the fermionic forms will be discussed in Section 2. For any ν, $\lambda \in P_+$, define the fermionic form by

$$m(\nu, \lambda, q) := \sum_{\tau} q^{-(\nu, \tau_1)} \prod_{k\geq 1} q^{T(\tau_k)} \big[\nu - \sum_{l=1}^{k} \tau_l, \tau_k - \tau_{k+1}\big], \tag{1}$$

where the sum is taken over all partitions $\tau \in \mathcal{P}^I$ such that

(1) $\nu - \sum_{l=1}^{k} \tau_l \in P_+$, for any $k \geq 1$,
(2) $|\tau| = \nu - \lambda$.

It is clear that $m(\nu,\lambda,q)$ can be nonzero only for $\lambda\le\nu$ (i.e. $\nu-\lambda\in Q_+$). For any $\nu,\lambda\in P$, define the second fermionic form (see [14, (4.16)]) by

$$n(\nu,\lambda,q):=\sum_{|\tau|=\nu-\lambda}q^{-(\nu,\tau_1)}\prod_{k\ge1}q^{T(\tau_k)}\Big[\nu-\sum_{l=1}^{k}\tau_l,\tau_k-\tau_{k+1}\Big], \tag{2}$$

where the sum is taken over all partitions $\tau\in\mathcal{P}^I$ of $\nu-\lambda$. The only difference with the definition of $m(\nu,\lambda,q)$ is that now we do not impose any positivity conditions on $\nu-\sum_{l=1}^k\tau_l$. Again, it is clear that $n(\nu,\lambda,q)$ can be nonzero only for $\lambda\le\nu$.

It was conjectured by Lusztig [25] that if Γ is of type ADE then the fermionic forms are related to the Poincaré polynomials of Nakajima's quiver varieties associated to Γ. Let $\mathcal{M}(\alpha,\nu)$ be the quiver variety (see [31, 32] and Section 5), where $\alpha\in Q_+$ and $\nu\in P_+$. It is known that $\mathcal{M}(\alpha,\nu)$ is a smooth symplectic manifold of dimension $2d(\alpha,\nu)$, where $d(\alpha,\nu)=(\nu,\alpha)-T(\alpha)$. Define $P(\mathcal{M}(\alpha,\nu),q)=\sum_{i\ge0}\dim H^i_c(\mathcal{M}(\alpha,\nu),\mathbb{C})q^{i/2}$. In this paper we prove

Theorem 1.1 (Fermionic Lusztig conjecture)**.** *If Γ is of type ADE then, for any $\nu\in P_+$, we have*

$$\sum_{\alpha\in Q_+}q^{-d(\alpha,\nu)}P(\mathcal{M}(\alpha,\nu),q)e^{\nu-\alpha}=\sum_{\lambda\in P}n(\nu,\lambda,q^{-1})\operatorname{ch}M(\lambda),$$

where $M(\lambda)$ is the Verma module over $\mathfrak{g}(\Gamma)$ of highest weight λ.

It should be noted that the original fermionic conjecture of Lusztig is slightly different from our formulation. It says that, for any $\alpha\in Q_+$ and $\nu\in P_+$, one has

$$q^{-d(\alpha,\nu)}P(\mathcal{M}(\alpha,\nu),q)=\sum_{\lambda\in P_+}m(\nu,\lambda,q^{-1})\dim L(\lambda)_{\nu-\alpha},$$

where $L(\lambda)$ is the irreducible module of highest weight λ. Equivalently, for any $\nu\in P_+$,

$$\sum_{\alpha\in Q_+}q^{-d(\alpha,\nu)}P(\mathcal{M}(\alpha,\nu),q)e^{\nu-\alpha}=\sum_{\lambda\in P_+}m(\nu,\lambda,q^{-1})\operatorname{ch}L(\lambda).$$

As explained in [33], this formula is a q-analog of the Kirillov-Reshetikhin conjecture. In that conjecture there also occur the fermionic forms $m(\nu,\lambda,q)$ (for $q=1$) and characters $\operatorname{ch}L(\lambda)$ of irreducible modules. However, the known proofs (see, e.g., [17, 33]) deal actually with a slightly modified formula, which has the fermionic forms $n(\nu,\lambda,1)$ instead of $m(\nu,\lambda,1)$ and the Verma modules $M(\lambda)$ instead of the irreducible modules $L(\lambda)$. We have made analogous modifications in the fermionic Lusztig conjecture. The equality $m(\nu,\lambda,q)=n(\nu,\lambda,q)$ for $\nu,\lambda\in P_+$ was conjectured in [13, Conjecture 4.3]. This problem is still open, as far as we know. On the other hand, it follows from the above theorem and the existence of the Weyl group action on the cohomologies of quiver varieties [27, 31] that

$$n(\nu,w\cdot\lambda,q)=(-1)^{l(w)}n(\nu,\lambda,q),$$

where w is an element of the Weyl group and $w\cdot\lambda=w(\lambda+\rho)-\rho$. This was also a part of [13, Conjecture 4.3].

The above theorem will be an easy corollary of a more general result, relating the fermionic forms with the Poincaré polynomials of quiver varieties for arbitrary quivers Γ. First, let us recall the Hausel's formula (see [15, Theorem 5] and Theorem 6.3), giving an explicit expression for the generating function of the Poincaré polynomials of quiver varieties. For any $\nu \in P$, define $r(\nu, q) \in \mathbb{Q}(q)[\![x_i | i \in I]\!]$ by

$$r(\nu, q^{-1}) := \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{P}^I} x^{|\tau|} q^{-(\nu, \tau_1)} \prod_{k \geq 1} q^{T(\tau_k)} \big[\infty, \tau_k - \tau_{k+1}\big], \tag{3}$$

where $x^\alpha = \prod_{i \in I} x_i^{\alpha^i}$ for $\alpha \in Q_+$. The Hausel's formula says that, for any $\nu \in P_+$, we have

$$\sum_{\alpha \in Q_+} q^{-d(\alpha, \nu)} P(\mathcal{M}(\alpha, \nu), q) x^\alpha = \frac{r(\nu, q)}{r(0, q)}.$$

Define the generating function

$$n(\nu, q) = \sum_{\lambda \in P} n(\nu, \lambda, q) x^{\nu - \lambda} = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{P}^I} x^{|\tau|} q^{-(\nu, \tau_1)} \prod_{k \geq 1} q^{T(\tau_k)} \big[\nu - \sum_{l=1}^{k} \tau_l, \tau_k - \tau_{k+1}\big].$$

Our main combinatorial result (see Theorem 7.4) says that, for any $\nu \in P$, we have

$$n(\nu, q^{-1}) = r(\nu, q) r(0, q^{-1}). \tag{4}$$

This is a purely combinatorial formula that can be easily verified on computer. The starting point of the paper was an empiric observation of this formula. Using it together with the Hausel's formula, we get

Theorem 1.2. *For any $\nu \in P_+$, we have*

$$\sum_{\alpha \in Q_+} q^{-d(\alpha, \nu)} P(\mathcal{M}(\alpha, \nu), q) x^\alpha = \frac{n(\nu, q^{-1})}{r(0, q) r(0, q^{-1})}.$$

This result is used then in Section 8 to prove the fermionic conjecture of Lusztig.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give some combinatorial prerequisites including λ-rings and the definition of fermionic forms. In Section 3 we recall the basic results concerning the polynomial-count varieties. In Section 4 we discuss the geometric invariant theory over an arbitrary ring and prove the existence of good quotients in the situation that occurs when constructing the moduli spaces of quiver representations. In Section 5 we recall the construction of moduli spaces of stable quiver representations and, in particular, the construction of quiver varieties. In Section 6 we give a new proof of Hausel's formula based on Hua's formula counting the absolutely indecomposable quiver representations over finite fields. We also discuss there the proof of the first Kac conjecture due to Hausel. In Section 7 we give a proof of Theorem 1.2. In Section 8 we use Theorem 1.2 together with Hua's formula to prove the fermionic conjecture of Lusztig.

2. q-BINOMIAL COEFFICIENTS AND λ-RINGS

For any expression f depending on q, we define the conjugation $\overline{f(q)} := f(q^{-1})$, if it makes sense. Throughout the paper, we will use the λ-ring structure on the ring of power series over $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ (see [28, Appendix]). We endow the ring $\mathbb{Q}(q)[\![x_1, \ldots, x_r]\!]$ with the structure of a λ-ring in terms of Adams operations by

$$\psi_n(f(q, x_1, \ldots, x_r)) = f(q^n, x_1^n, \ldots, x_r^n), \qquad f \in \mathbb{Q}(q)[\![x_1, \ldots, x_r]\!].$$

This λ-ring structure also endows $\mathbb{Q}(q)[\![x_1,\dots,x_r]\!]$ with λ-operations and σ-operations. Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the maximal ideal of $\mathbb{Q}(q)[\![x_1,\dots,x_r]\!]$. Define the map $\operatorname{Exp}:\mathfrak{m}\to 1+\mathfrak{m}$ by the formula

$$\operatorname{Exp}(f)=\sum_{k\ge0}\sigma_k(f)=\exp\Big(\sum_{k\ge1}\frac{1}{k}\psi_k(f)\Big),$$

where the map exp (as well as the map log used below) is defined as in [1, Ch.II §6]. For any $f,\, g\in\mathfrak{m}$, we have

$$\operatorname{Exp}(f+g)=\operatorname{Exp}(f)\operatorname{Exp}(g).$$

The map Exp has an inverse $\operatorname{Log}:1+\mathfrak{m}\to\mathfrak{m}$ which is given by the formula of Cadogan (see [2, 9, 28])

$$\operatorname{Log}(f)=\sum_{k\ge1}\frac{\mu(k)}{k}\psi_k(\log(f)),$$

where μ is the Möbius function.

For any $n\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $m\in\mathbb{N}$, we define the q-binomial coefficients by

$$[n,m]=\begin{bmatrix}n+m\\m\end{bmatrix}:=\frac{\prod_{k=1}^m(1-q^{n+k})}{\prod_{k=1}^m(1-q^k)}\in\mathbb{Q}(q),$$

$$[\infty,m]:=\frac{1}{\prod_{k=1}^m(1-q^k)}\in\mathbb{Q}(q).$$

These functions can also be defined in the following way. Define the q-Pochhammer symbols (cf. [18])

$$\begin{aligned}(x;q)_\infty=(1-x)_q^\infty&:=\prod_{k\ge0}(1-q^kx)=\prod_{k\ge0}\operatorname{Exp}(q^kx)^{-1}\\&=\operatorname{Exp}\Big(\sum_{k\ge0}q^kx\Big)^{-1}=\operatorname{Exp}\left(\frac{x}{q-1}\right)\in\mathbb{Q}(q)[\![x]\!].\end{aligned}$$

and

$$(x;q)_n=(1-x)_q^n:=\frac{(x;q)_\infty}{(q^nx;q)_\infty}=\begin{cases}\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}(1-q^kx), & n\ge0,\\ \prod_{k=n}^{-1}(1-q^kx)^{-1}, & n<0.\end{cases}$$

Then

$$[n,m]=\frac{(q;q)_{m+n}}{(q;q)_n(q;q)_m}=\frac{(q^{n+1};q)_m}{(q;q)_m},\qquad[\infty,m]=\frac{1}{(q;q)_m}.$$

Theorem 2.1 (Heine's formula, see [18, Theorem 13.1])**.** *We have*

$$\sum_{k\ge0}\frac{(t;q)_k}{(q;q)_k}x^k=\frac{(tx;q)_\infty}{(x;q)_\infty}=\operatorname{Exp}\left(\frac{1-t}{1-q}x\right)$$

in $\mathbb{Q}(q)[t][\![x]\!]$.

In particular, taking $t=0$ or $t=q^{n+1}$, we obtain

Lemma 2.2. *We have*

$$\sum_{k\ge0}[\infty,k]x^k=\operatorname{Exp}\left(\frac{x}{1-q}\right),$$

and, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$*,*

$$\sum_{k\geq 0}[n,k]x^k = \operatorname{Exp}\left(\frac{1-q^{n+1}}{1-q}x\right).$$

For any $\nu = (\nu_i)_{i=1}^r \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ and $\alpha = (\alpha^i)_{i=1}^r \in \mathbb{N}^r$, we define

$$[\nu,\alpha] := \prod_{i=1}^r [\nu_i,\alpha^i].$$

The same notation is used for a weight vector $\nu \in P$ and a root vector $\alpha \in Q_+$ (see the introduction).

We discuss now the relation between the definition of fermionic forms in the introduction and the usual definition [14, (4.3)], [13, (4.5)]. Given a sequence $\nu = (\nu_k \in P_+)_{k\geq 1}$ with almost all elements being zero and $\lambda \in P_+$, one defines loc.cit.

$$m(\nu,\lambda,q) := \sum_{m=(m_k)} q^{c(m)} \prod_{k\geq 1}[p_k(m), m_k],$$

where the sum runs over all $m = (m_k \in Q_+)_{k\geq 1}$ (with almost all elements being zero) satisfying

(1) $p_k(m) := \sum_{l\geq 1}\min\{k,l\}(\nu_l - m_l) \in P_+$, for any $k \geq 1$,
(2) $\sum_{k\geq 1} k(\nu_k - m_k) = \lambda$

and where

$$c(m) := \sum_{k,l\geq 1}\min\{k,l\}\frac{1}{2}(m_k,m_l) - \sum_{k,l\geq 1}\min\{k,l\}(\nu_k,m_l).$$

If we define $\pi_k := \sum_{l\geq k}\nu_l$ and $\tau_k = \tau_k(m) := \sum_{l\geq k} m_l$ for $k \geq 1$ then it holds

(1) $p_k(m) = \sum_{l=1}^k(\pi_l - \tau_l)$,
(2) $\sum_{k\geq 1}(\pi_k - \tau_k) = \lambda$,
(3) $c(m) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k\geq 1}(\tau_k,\tau_k) - \sum_{k\geq 1}(\pi_k,\tau_k)$.

This follows from the following easy fact

Lemma 2.3. *Let* $\pi, \tau \in \mathcal{P}$ *be partitions and let* $n_k := \pi_k - \pi_{k+1}$*,* $m_k := \tau_k - \tau_{k+1}$ *for* $k \geq 1$*. Then we have*

$$\sum_{k,l\geq 1}\min\{k,l\}n_k m_l = \sum_{k\geq 1}\pi_k\tau_k.$$

We can now rewrite the definition of the fermionic form:

$$m(\nu,\lambda,q) = \sum_{\tau}\prod_{k\geq 1} q^{T(\tau_k)-(\pi_k,\tau_k)}[\sum_{l=1}^k(\pi_l-\tau_l), \tau_k - \tau_{k+1}],$$

where the sum runs over all partitions $\tau \in \mathcal{P}^I$ (we identify $\mathbb{Z}^I$ with the root lattice Q) satisfying

(1) $\sum_{l=1}^k(\pi_l - \tau_l) \in P_+$ for all $k \geq 1$,
(2) $\sum_{k\geq 1}(\pi_k - \tau_k) = \lambda$.

The definition of the fermionic form given in the introduction is precisely the last one.

3. Polynomial-count varieties

By an algebraic variety over a field k we will understand a separated scheme of finite type over k. All the algebraic varieties of this section will be assumed to be quasi-projective. Given an algebraic variety X over a field k and a prime number $l \neq \operatorname{char} k$, we define $H^i_c(X,\mathbb{Q}_l) = H^i_c(X_{\overline{k}},\mathbb{Q}_l)$ to be the i-th group of etale cohomologies with compact support of $X_{\overline{k}} = X \otimes_k \overline{k}$, where $\overline{k}$ is a separable closure of k.

Definition 3.1. Given an algebraic variety X over a field k and a prime number $l \neq \operatorname{char} k$, we define the Poincaré polynomial $P(X,q) \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{1/2}]$ of X by the formula

$$P(X,q) = \sum_{i\geq 0}(-1)^i \dim H^i_c(X,\mathbb{Q}_l)q^{i/2}.$$

Definition 3.2. An algebraic variety X over a finite field k is called strictly polynomial-count if there exists a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{Q}[q]$ such that, for any finite extension $\mathbb{F}_q/k$, we have

$$P(q) = \#X(\mathbb{F}_q).$$

X is called polynomial-count if it is strictly polynomial-count over some finite field extension of k. In both cases the polynomial P is called the counting polynomial of X.

Example 3.3. The scheme given by $x^2 = 2$ in $\mathbb{A}^1_{\mathbb{F}_3}$ is polynomial-count but not strictly polynomial-count.

Remark 3.4. Let X be an algebraic variety over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$. If X is strictly polynomial-count with a counting polynomial $P(q) = \sum_{i\geq 0} a_i q^i$ then its zeta-function equals

$$Z(X,t) = \exp\Big(\sum_{n\geq 1}\frac{1}{n}\#X(\mathbb{F}_{q^n})t^n\Big) = \operatorname{Exp}(tP)(q) = \prod_{i\geq 0}(1-tq^i)^{-a_i}.$$

As $Z(X,t)$ is a rational function, it follows that P has integer coefficients. Moreover, X is strictly polynomial-count if and only if its zeta-function has zeros and poles only of the form q^k, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Using the Grothendieck-Lefschetz formula one can express the zeta-function [5, 1.5.4]

$$Z(X,t) = \prod_{i\geq 0}\det(1-tF|H^i_c(X,\mathbb{Q}_l))^{(-1)^{i+1}},$$

where $F \in \operatorname{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{F}_q}/\mathbb{F}_q)$ is a Frobenius element. This implies that if the eigenvalues of Frobenius F on $H^*_c(X,\mathbb{Q}_l)$ are all of the form q^k, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, then X is strictly polynomial-count. If the eigenvalues of Frobenius F on $H^*_c(X,\mathbb{Q}_l)$ are all of the form ξq^k, where ξ is a root of unity and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, then X is polynomial-count (cf. [22, Definition 2.6]). The last formula also implies, that if the cohomologies of X are concentrated in even degrees and X is polynomial-count then the coefficients of the counting polynomial are nonnegative.

Definition 3.5. Let X be an algebraic variety over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$ and let $l \neq \operatorname{char}\mathbb{F}_q$ be a prime number. X is called l-pure [3] if, for any $i \geq 0$, the conjugates of the eigenvalues of Frobenius F on $H^i_c(X,\mathbb{Q}_l)$ have absolute value $q^{i/2}$ (the eigenvalues of Frobenius are algebraic numbers [6, Theorem 1]).

Lemma 3.6 (cf. [3, Lemma A.1])**.** *Let X be an algebraic variety over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$ and let $l \neq \operatorname{char} \mathbb{F}_q$ be a prime number. Assume that X is l-pure and is polynomial-count with a counting polynomial P. Then the cohomologies with compact support of X are concentrated in even degrees and the Poincaré polynomial of X equals P and has nonnegative coefficients.*

Proof. We can suppose that X is strictly polynomial-count. As we have mentioned already, the zeta-function

$$Z(X,t) = \prod_{i\geq 0} \det(1 - tF|H_c^i(X, \mathbb{Q}_l))^{(-1)^{i+1}}$$

has zeros and poles of the form q^k, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Using the purity of X, we deduce that $H_c^i(X, \mathbb{Q}_l) = 0$ for odd i. Moreover, the eigenvalues of F on even cohomologies are of the form q^k, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. This implies that the eigenvalues of F on $H_c^{2i}(X, \mathbb{Q}_l)$ equal q^i. It follows that

$$Z(X,t) = \prod_{i\geq 0} (1 - tq^i)^{-\dim H_c^{2i}(X,\mathbb{Q}_l)}.$$

But we have seen that $Z(X,t) = \prod_{i\geq 0}(1 - tq^i)^{-a_i}$, where $P(q) = \sum_{i\geq 0} a_i q^i$. This implies that $P(q) = \sum_{i\geq 0} \dim H_c^{2i}(X, \mathbb{Q}_l) q^i = P(X, q)$. □

Let F be a number field. All places of F that we will consider are assumed to be finite (we identify them with the maximal ideals of the ring of integers $\mathcal{O}_F$).

Remark 3.7. Let F be a number field and let $\mathcal{O}$ be its ring of integers. Given an algebraic variety X over F, there exists a scheme X' over some localization $\mathcal{O}_f$ of the ring $\mathcal{O}$ such that $X' \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_f} F \simeq X$. This allows us to define the schemes $X'_{k(v)} = X' \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_f} k(v)$ over residue fields $k(v)$ for almost all places v of F ("almost all" means here all except a finite set). If X'' is a different scheme over some localization $\mathcal{O}_g$ such that $X'' \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_g} F \simeq X$ then X' and X'' are isomorphic over some localization of $\mathcal{O}$ and therefore $X'_{k(v)} \simeq X''_{k(v)}$ for almost all places v of F. We will assume that some scheme X' as above is fixed and denote the schemes $X'_{k(v)}$ just by $X_{k(v)}$. For any field extension $k/k(v)$, we define $X(k) = X_{k(v)}(k)$. Again, this is well-defined for almost all places v of F.

Remark 3.8. Let X be an algebraic variety over a number field F and let l be a prime number. Given an embedding $i : \overline{F} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$, consider the scheme $X_{\mathbb{C}} = X \otimes_F \mathbb{C}$ and endow the set $X_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C})$ with the structure of a complex space. By the Base Change Theorem [8, Theorem 1.8.7], we have

$$H_c^i(X, \mathbb{Q}_l) \simeq H_c^i(X_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathbb{Q}_l).$$

By the Comparison Theorem [8, Theorem 1.11.6], we have

$$H_c^i(X_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathbb{Q}_l) \simeq H_c^i(X_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Q}_l),$$

where on the right hand side we consider the usual cohomologies with compact support. These formulas imply, in particular, that the Poincaré polynomial of X is independent of the prime number l. For almost all places v of F, we have

$$\dim H_c^i(X, \mathbb{Q}_l) = \dim H_c^i(X_{k(v)}, \mathbb{Q}_l), \quad i \geq 0.$$

Indeed, let X be defined over a localization $\mathcal{O}_f$, where $\mathcal{O}$ is a ring of integers of F. Denote by $\pi : X \to \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_f$ the corresponding structure map. For any $i \geq 0$ the sheaf $R^i \pi_! \mathbb{Q}_l$ is constructible [8, Theorem 1.12.15]. This implies [8, Proposition 1.12.10] that this sheaf is lisse (i.e. the corresponding l-adic projective system consists of locally-constant sheaves) over some open subset of $\operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_f$. It follows that the dimensions of the stalks at all points of this open set coincide and this proves our statement. We deduce that, for almost all places v of F, the Poincaré polynomials of $X_{k(v)}$ and X coincide.

Definition 3.9. An algebraic variety X over a number field F is called strictly polynomial-count if, for almost all places v of F, the algebraic variety $X_{k(v)}$ over a finite field $k(v)$ is strictly polynomial-count. An algebraic variety X over a number field F is called polynomial-count if X is strictly polynomial-count over a finite field extension of F. Given a prime number l, X is called l-pure if, for almost all places v of F, the algebraic variety $X_{k(v)}$ is l-pure. X is called pure if it is l-pure, for all prime numbers l.

Remark 3.10. If X is a polynomial-count algebraic variety over a number field F then $X_{k(v)}$ is polynomial-count for almost all places v of F. We do not know if the converse statement is true.

Theorem 3.11 (Katz [16, Theorem 6.1.4])**.** *Let X be a polynomial-count algebraic variety over a number field F. Then the algebraic varieties $X_{k(v)}$ have an identical counting polynomial $P \in \mathbb{Z}[q]$ for almost all places v of F. The virtual Hodge polynomial* [4] *of X can be expressed as*

$$E(X; u, v) = P(uv).$$

Proposition 3.12 (see [3])**.** *Let X be a nonsingular algebraic variety over a number field F. Assume that there exists a $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}$-action on X with the properties*

1. *for every $x \in X$ there exists the limit $\lim_{t \to 0} tx$;*
2. *$X^{\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}}$ is projective.*

Then X is l-pure for any prime number l.

Proposition 3.13 (Nakajima [3])**.** *Let X be a nonsingular algebraic variety over a number field F and let $\pi : X \to \mathbb{A}^1$ be a smooth morphism over F. Assume that there exists a $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}$-action on X with the properties*

1. *for every $x \in X$ there exists the limit $\lim_{t \to 0} tx$;*
2. *$\pi : X_F \to \mathbb{A}^1_F$ is $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}$-equivariant with respect to some $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}$-action on $\mathbb{A}^1_F$ of positive weight.*

Then, for every $\lambda \in F$, the algebraic varieties $\pi^{-1}(0)$ and $\pi^{-1}(\lambda)$ represent the same element in $K_0(\mathbf{Sch}/\overline{Q})$ (see e.g. [16, Katz]*). In particular, if $\pi^{-1}(\lambda)$ is polynomial-count then so is $\pi^{-1}(0)$ and they have the same counting polynomial.*

4. Geometric invariant theory

Let R be a noetherian ring and let G be an affine group scheme over R.

Definition 4.1. A morphism of finite type $\pi : X \to Y$ of schemes over R, where X is endowed with an action of group G, is called a good quotient if

1. π is G-invariant, affine, and surjective;
2. the natural homomorphism $\mathcal{O}_Y \to (\pi_* \mathcal{O}_X)^G$ is an isomorphism;
3. for any closed G-stable subset Z of X, $\pi(Z)$ is closed in Y;

(4) for any geometric point $R \to k$, π induces a bijection between $Y(k)$ and the quotient of $X(k)$ by the equivalence relation

$$x \sim y \Leftrightarrow \overline{Gx} \cap \overline{G}y \neq \emptyset \text{ in } X \otimes_R k.$$

It is called a universal (respectively, a uniform) good quotient if it stays a good quotient after any base change (respectively, any flat base change) $Y' \to Y$. A good quotient is called a geometric quotient if all the orbits of the geometric points of X are closed.

Remark 4.2. Sometimes the condition that π is affine is omitted (cf. [30, Def. 0.6]). If $\pi : X \to Y$ is a good quotient and $Z_1, \ldots, Z_n$ are G-stable closed subsets of X then

$$\pi\Big(\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} Z_i\Big) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \pi(Z_i).$$

It is proved in [36, Remark 8] (cf. [30, Remark 0.6]) that good quotients are categorical quotients ([30, Def. 0.5]).

Theorem 4.3 (Seshadri [36, Theorem 3])**.** *Let G be a reductive group scheme acting on an affine scheme $X = \operatorname{Spec} A$ over R. Assume there exists a closed G-invariant embedding $X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}^n_R = \operatorname{Spec} SV^\vee$, where V is a G-R-module, free of rank n over R. Then $\pi : X \to Y = \operatorname{Spec} A^G$ is a uniform good quotient. If R is universally Japanese* [11, Ch.0, 23.1.1] *then Y is of finite type over R.*

Proof. Everything except the last condition of Definition 4.1 is proved in [36, Theorem 3]. The last condition is also stated there but it relies on [36, Proposition 6], whose proof (and also the statement) contains certain inaccuracies. Still, we can prove a similar result. Namely, we prove that for any two geometric points $x, y \in X(k)$ we have

$$\overline{Gx} \cap \overline{Gy} = \emptyset$$

in $X \otimes_R k$ if and only if there exists some $f \in \Gamma(X, \mathcal{O}_X)^G$ with $f(x) \neq f(y)$. The "if" direction is trivial. To prove the "only if" direction, we make the same reductions as in Proposition 4.6 and assume that $X = \operatorname{Spec} SV^\vee$, R is a discrete valuation ring or a field and $R \to k$ is surjective. Next, we can find $f_0 \in SV^\vee$ such that $f_0(\overline{Gx}) = 1$ and $f_0(\overline{Gy}) = 0$. The R-module W generated by the G-translates of f_0 in $SV^\vee$ is finitely generated [36, Prop. 3] and is free as R is a discrete valuation ring. Consider a canonical map $\varphi : \operatorname{Spec} SV^\vee \to \operatorname{Spec} SW$. Then $\varphi(x)$ is a G-invariant point in the affine space $\operatorname{Spec}(SW \otimes_R k)$, $\varphi(y) = 0$ and $\varphi(x) \neq 0$. Applying [36, Theorem 1], we can find a homogeneous polynomial $f_1 \in (SW)^G$ of positive degree such that $f_1(\varphi(x)) \neq 0$. It is clear that $f_1(\varphi(y)) = 0$. We define now $f = f_1\varphi$. The result, which has just been proved, implies the last condition of Definition 4.1 if we can show that $X(k) \to Y(k)$ is surjective. But X is of finite type over R and therefore it is also of finite type over Y. It follows that a surjective morphism $X \to Y$ induces a surjective map $X(k) \to Y(k)$. □

Remark 4.4. Excellent rings are universally Japanese [11, 7.8.3]. In particular, any algebra of finite type over a field or over $\mathbb{Z}$ is universally Japanese.

Let an affine group G act on an affine scheme X over R. Given a character $\chi : G \to \mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}$, we can endow the line bundle $L = X \times \mathbb{A}^1_R$ over X with a G-linearization, where the action of G on the second factor is given by χ. Let us recall [30, Ch.1, Def. 1.7] that a geometric point x of X is called L-semistable (we will also say χ-semistable or just semistable) if there exists a section $s \in \Gamma(X, L^n)^G$, $n \geq 1$ such that $s(x) \neq 0$. There exists an open subscheme X^{ss} of X, such that the semistable points of X are precisely the geometric points of X^{ss}. The embedding of graded algebras

$$\bigoplus_{n\geq 0} \Gamma(X, L^n)^G \to \bigoplus_{n\geq 0} \Gamma(X, L^n)$$

induces the map

$$X^{ss} \to \operatorname{Proj} \bigoplus_{n\geq 0} \Gamma(X, L^n)^G$$

which is known to be a good quotient if R is an algebraically closed field and G is reductive [21]. The goal of this section is to prove this result for an arbitrary ring R (under certain conditions). This result is not covered by the results of [36] but, as we will see, it can be deduced from them. From now on, we assume that G is reductive and that there exists a closed G-invariant embedding $X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}^n_R = \operatorname{Spec} SV^\vee$, where V is a G-R-module, free of rank n over R.

Proposition 4.5 (cf. [10, Ch.0, 10.3.1], [36, Theorem 1])**.** *Let A be a discrete valuation ring, m be its maximal ideal, and $k = A/m$ be its residue field. Let $k \hookrightarrow l$ be a field extension. Then there exists a flat homomorphism $A \to B$, where B is a discrete valuation ring such that the maximal ideal of B equals mB and the residue field of B is k-isomorphic to l.*

Proof. We will show that the construction of [10, Ch.0, 10.3.1] gives a discrete valuation ring if A is a discrete valuation ring.

If $l = k(t)$, where t is a variable, then one considers $A' = A[t]$, $m' = mA'$, and defines $B = A'_{m'}$. It is proved in [10, Ch.0, 10.3.1] that B is local, noetherian and satisfies all conditions of the proposition except the condition that B is a discrete valuation ring. But it is clear that B is a domain and its maximal ideal $m'B$ is a principal ideal. This implies that B is a discrete valuation ring.

Assume now that $l = k(t)$, where t is algebraic over k. Let $f \in k[x]$ be the minimal polynomial of t and let $F \in A[x]$ be the monic polynomial that projects to f. One defines then $B = A[x]/(F)$ and shows (see [10, Ch.0, 10.3.1]) that B is local, noetherian and satisfies all conditions of the proposition except the fact that B is a discrete valuation ring. It is clear that the maximal ideal mB of B is a principal ideal. To show that B is a domain, we note first that F is irreducible in $K[x]$, where K is a field of fractions of A. This follows from Gauß's lemma [38, Ch.1, §17, Lemma 1] and the fact that f is irreducible in $k[x]$. Consider now any two polynomials $F_1, F_2 \in A[x]$ such that $F_1F_2 \in FA[x]$. Then F divides one of them in $K[x]$ and therefore, again by Gauß's lemma, also in $A[x]$. This implies that $A[x]/FA[x]$ is a domain.

The next steps of the proof repeat the remaining part of the proof of [10, Ch.0, 10.3.1]. We just note that, given a filtered system (A_i, f_{ij}) of discrete valuation rings $(A_i, m_i)_{i\in I}$ such that $f_{ij} : A_i \to A_j$ are flat homomorphisms and $m_j = m_iA_j$ for $i < j$, the colimit $B = \operatorname{colim} A_i$ of the system is a discrete valuation ring. Indeed, it is a local noetherian ring with a maximal ideal $m_B = m_iB$, for any $i \in I$, by [10, Ch.0, 10.3.3]. It follows that m_B is a principal ideal. Moreover, B is an integral domain as a colimit of integral domains. This implies that B is a discrete valuation ring. □

The following result will be very important in Remark 5.5.

Proposition 4.6. *A geometric point $x \in X(k)$ is semistable if and only if for some lift $\hat{x} \in L(k)$ of x, the closure $\overline{G\hat{x}}$ does not intersect the zero section of L.*

Proof. We can assume that $X = \operatorname{Spec} SV^\vee$. The "only if" part is trivial. Let us prove the "if" part. Assume that there exists some lift $\hat{x} \in L(k)$ of x such that the closure $\overline{G\hat{x}}$ does not intersect the zero section. Let W be a G-module, free of rank 1 over R, given by the character χ, and let $t \in W$ be its basis element. Then $L \simeq \operatorname{Spec} S(V^\vee \oplus W^\vee)$ as a G-scheme and $\Gamma(X, L^n) = SV^\vee \otimes W^{\otimes n}$ as a G-module. We have to show the existence of some section $s = s_0 \otimes t^n \in (SV^\vee \otimes W^{\otimes n})^G$, $n \geq 1$ such that $s(x) \neq 0$ or, equivalently $s_0(x) \neq 0$. Note that if $R \to R' \to k$ is a factorization with a flat first morphism then it is enough to find the section $s \in (SV^\vee \otimes W^{\otimes n} \otimes R')^{G \otimes R'}$ with the same property because

$$(SV^\vee \otimes W^{\otimes n} \otimes R')^{G \otimes R'} = (SV^\vee \otimes W^{\otimes n})^G \otimes R'$$

by [36, Lemma 2].

After a flat base change, we may suppose that G is split reductive over R (see [7, Exp. 22, Cor. 2.3], [36, p.239]) and therefore G is obtained by a base change from a split reductive group $G_{\mathbb{Z}}$ over $\mathbb{Z}$ [7, Exp. 25, Theorem 1.1]. By [36, Prop. 1] we can embed V as a pure G-R-submodule into a finite direct sum of $R[G]$ (pure submodule means that it stays a submodule after any base change). Then by [36, Cor.2 of Prop.3] there exists a $G_{\mathbb{Z}}$-module U, free of finite rank over $\mathbb{Z}$, and a pure embedding $V \hookrightarrow U \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} R$ of G-modules. Hence, it is enough to find a section $s \in (SU^\vee \otimes W_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\otimes n})^{G_{\mathbb{Z}}}$ with $s(x) \neq 0$. Thus, we may suppose that $R = \mathbb{Z}$.

If $\operatorname{char} k = 0$ then $\mathbb{Z} \to k$ is flat and we may suppose by the above discussion that $R = k$. If $\operatorname{char} k = p > 0$ then there exists a factorization $\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}_{(p)} \to k$ with a flat first morphism. Moreover, by Proposition 4.5 there exists a factorization $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)} \to B \to k$ with a flat first morphism and such that B is a discrete valuation ring with a residue field k. By the above discussion we can assume that $R = B$. Thus, we can suppose that R is a discrete valuation ring or a field and $R \to k$ is surjective.

There exists some $\overline{f} \in S(V^\vee \oplus W) \otimes k$ such that $\overline{f}(\overline{G\hat{x}}) = 1$ and $\overline{f}(X \times \{0\}) = 0$. The last equality means that $\overline{f} \in SV^\vee \otimes (\bigoplus_{n \geq 1} W^{\otimes n}) \otimes k$. Let us choose some representative $f \in SV^\vee \otimes (\bigoplus_{n \geq 1} W^{\otimes n})$ of $\overline{f}$. The R-module U generated by the G-translations of f in $SV^\vee \otimes (\bigoplus_{n \geq 1} W^{\otimes n})$ is finitely generated [36, Prop. 3] and is free as R is a discrete valuation ring (or a field). The induced morphism $\varphi : L \to \operatorname{Spec} SU$ maps $\hat{x}$ to a nonzero G-invariant point. Applying [36, Theorem 1], we can find some G-invariant homogeneous polynomial $f_1 \in SU$ of positive degree such that $f_1(\varphi(\hat{x})) \neq 0$. The image of f_1 under the map $SU \to S(V^\vee \oplus W)$ is contained in $(SV^\vee \otimes (\bigoplus_{n \geq 1} W^{\otimes n}))^G$. Hence, for some $s \in (SV^\vee \otimes W^{\otimes n})^G$, $n \geq 1$, we have $s(x) \neq 0$. □

Corollary 4.7. *For any morphism $R \to R'$, we have*

$$(X \otimes_R R')^{ss} = X^{ss} \otimes_R R'.$$

Theorem 4.8. *Let R be a noetherian ring, G be a reductive group scheme over R acting on an affine scheme $X = \operatorname{Spec} A$ over R and $\chi : G \to \mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}$ be a character. Assume there exists a closed G-invariant embedding $X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^r = \operatorname{Spec} SV^\vee$, where*

V is a G-R-module, free of rank r over R. Then the map

$$\pi : X^{ss} \to Y = \operatorname{Proj} \bigoplus_{n\ge 0} \Gamma(X, L^n)^G,$$

where X^{ss} is a subscheme of χ-semistable points of X, is a uniform good quotient. If R is universally Japanese [11, Ch.0, 23.1.1] *then Y is of finite type over R and the canonical morphism $Y \to \operatorname{Spec} A^G$ is projective.*

Proof. Let $B = \bigoplus_{n\ge 0} \Gamma(X, L^n)$. For any homogeneous $f \in B^G$ of positive degree d, consider an open subscheme $Y_f = \operatorname{Spec}(B^G)_{(f)}$ of Y. The preimage of Y_f in X^{ss} is $X_f = \operatorname{Spec} B_{(f)}$. Note that $(B^G)_{(f)} = (B_{(f)})^G$ because $(B^G)_f = (B_f)^G$ by [36, Lemma 2]. Thus, it will follow from Theorem 4.3 that $X_f \to Y_f$ is a good quotient if we show that there exists a closed G-invariant embedding $X_f \hookrightarrow \operatorname{Spec} SU$ for some G-module U, free over R. Let us denote by W the G-module, free of rank 1 over R, given by the character χ. Then $L = \operatorname{Spec}(A \otimes SW^\vee)$ as a G-scheme and $\Gamma(X, L^n) = A \otimes W^{\otimes n}$ as a G-module. It follows $B \simeq A \otimes SW = A[t]$ as G-algebras, where t denotes some basis element of W. The homogeneous element $f \in B^G$ can be written in the form $f_0 t^d$, where $f_0 \in A$ satisfies $g f_0 = \chi^{-d}(g) f_0$ for $g \in G$. A surjective morphism of algebras $A \otimes S(W^{\otimes d}) = A[t^d] \to B_{(f)}$, $t^d \mapsto 1/f_0$ is G-invariant and defines the required embedding of X_f in $X \times \mathbb{A}^1 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}^n \times \mathbb{A}^1$.

As Y_f with homogeneous $f \in B^G$ cover Y, we obtain that $X^{ss} \to Y$ satisfies all properties (except the last one) of a good quotient. To prove the last property of a good quotient, we note first that $X^{ss}(k) \to Y(k)$ is surjective, as we can apply Theorem 4.3 locally. If two geometric points in $X^{ss}(k)$ have different images in $Y(k)$ then the closures of their orbits do not intersect. Conversely, assume that $x_1, x_2 \in X^{ss}(k)$ are two geometric points such that the closures of their orbits do not intersect. We can find two homogeneous elements $f_1, f_2 \in B^G$ of the same positive degree such that $f_1(x_1) \ne 0$ and $f_2(x_2) \ne 0$. Then one of the functions $f_1, f_2, f_1 + f_2$ is nonzero at both points x_1, x_2. Let us denote this function by f. Then the closures of the orbits of x_1, x_2 do not intersect in $X_f \otimes_R k$. Applying Theorem 4.3, we obtain that x_1 and x_2 are mapped to different points under the map $X_f(k) \to Y_f(k)$.

Assume now that R is universally Japanese. We have seen that $B \simeq A \otimes SW$ as a G-algebra and therefore, by Theorem 4.3, B^G is of finite type over R. This implies that B^G is of finite type over A^G and therefore $\operatorname{Proj} B^G \to \operatorname{Spec} A^G$ is projective. As A^G is of finite type over R by Theorem 4.3, we obtain that $\operatorname{Proj} B^G$ is of finite type over R. □

Remark 4.9. A geometric point $x \in X(k)$ is called stable if it is semistable, Gx is closed in $X^{ss} \otimes k$ and the dimension of Gx equals $\dim G \otimes k$. There exists an open subscheme $Y^s \subset Y$ such that if $X^s = \pi^{-1}(Y^s)$ then the geometric points of X^s are precisely the stable points of X (see [36, Remark 9]). The map $\pi : X^s \to Y^s$ is a geometric quotient and it induces a bijection $X^s(k)/G(k) \to Y^s(k)$, for any algebraically closed field k (with a map $R \to k$).

Proposition 4.10. *Let G be a geometrically connected affine algebraic group acting on a scheme X over R in such a way that the stabilizers of the geometric points of X are connected. Let k be a finite field (with a map $R \to k$) and let $F \in \operatorname{Gal}(\overline{k}/k)$ be the Frobenius element. Then the map*

$$X(k)/G(k) \to (X(\overline{k})/G(\overline{k}))^F$$

is bijective.

Proof. To prove the injectivity, assume that $x, y \in X(k)$ are mapped to the same point, that is, there exists some $g \in G(\overline{k})$ with $gx = y$. This implies

$$gx = y = F(y) = F(gx) = F(g)F(x) = F(g)x.$$

Let $H \subset G(\overline{k})$ be the stabilizer of x. Then H is an F-invariant connected affine algebraic group and $g^{-1}F(g) \in H$. It follows from the Lang-Steinberg theorem [29, 37] that there exists some $h \in H$ such that $g^{-1}F(g) = hF(h^{-1})$. Then $F(gh) = gh$ and $(gh)x = gx = y$. This implies the injectivity.

To prove the surjectivity, consider a representative $x \in X(\overline{k})$ of some element from $(X(\overline{k})/G(\overline{k}))^F$. It satisfies $F(x) = gx$ for some $g \in G(\overline{k})$. By the Lang-Steinberg theorem there exists some $h \in G(\overline{k})$ such that $g^{-1} = h^{-1}F(h)$. This implies

$$F(hx) = F(h)F(x) = (hg^{-1})(gx) = hx$$

and therefore $hx \in X(\overline{k})^F = X(k)$. $\square$

Remark 4.11. Let $\mathcal{R}_\alpha = \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ be the space of representations of a quiver Γ and let k be a finite field. It is proved in [24, Lemma 5.2.1] and [24, Lemma 5.3.2] that the map

$$\mathcal{R}_\alpha(k)/\operatorname{GL}_\alpha(k) \to (\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\overline{k})/\operatorname{GL}_\alpha(\overline{k}))^F$$

is bijective. The proof in [24] is completely elementary.

Corollary 4.12. *With the notation of Theorem 4.8, assume that* G *is geometrically connected and acts freely on geometric points of* X^s*. Then* $\pi : X^s \to Y^s$ *induces a bijection* $X^s(k)/G(k) \to Y^s(k)$*, for any finite field* k *(with a map* $R \to k$*).*

Proof. Let $\overline{k}$ be the algebraic closure of k and let $F \in \operatorname{Gal}(\overline{k}/k)$ be the Frobenius element. We know that $X^s(\overline{k})/G(\overline{k}) \to Y^s(\overline{k})$ is a bijection. This implies that $Y^s(k) = Y^s(\overline{k})^F$ can be identified with $(X^s(\overline{k})/G(\overline{k}))^F$ and the claim follows from the above proposition. $\square$

5. Moduli spaces of quiver representations

Let (Γ, I) be a finite quiver, where Γ is the set of arrows and I is the set of vertices. We will usually denote the quiver just by Γ. For any arrow $h \in \Gamma$, we denote by h' and h'' its source and target, respectively. For any field k, we denote by $k\Gamma$ the path algebra of Γ over k. A $k\Gamma$-representation will be considered as a pair (V, x), where $V = \oplus_{i\in I} V_i$ is an I-graded k-vector space and $x = (x_h)_{h\in\Gamma}$ consists of homomorphisms $x_h : V_{h'} \to V_{h''}$.

We denote by $\overline{\Gamma}$ the double quiver of Γ, obtained from it by adjoining reverse arrows for all arrows in Γ. For any $h \in \overline{\Gamma}$, we denote by $\overline{h}$ the opposite arrow contained in $\overline{\Gamma}$. For any $\alpha = (\alpha^i)_{i\in I} \in \mathbb{Z}^I$ and $\nu = (\nu_i)_{i\in I} \in \mathbb{Z}^I$, we define $\nu \cdot \alpha := \sum_{i\in I} \nu_i \alpha^i$.

Given an I-graded vector space $V = \oplus_{i\in I} V_i$, we define its dimension to be $\dim V := (\dim V_i)_{i\in I} \in \mathbb{N}^I$. Given two I-graded vector spaces V and W, we denote the vector space of I-graded morphisms between them by $\operatorname{Hom}_I(V, W)$.

Let V be an I-graded vector space of dimension α. Define the space of representations

$$\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma, k) := \bigoplus_{h\in\Gamma} \operatorname{Hom}(V_{h'}, V_{h''}).$$

We can identify $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\overline{\Gamma},k)$ with $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma,k)\oplus\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma,k)^\vee$. There is an obvious action of the group

$$\mathrm{GL}_\alpha(k):=\prod_{i\in I}\mathrm{GL}_{\alpha^i}(k)$$

on $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma,k)$ and on $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\overline{\Gamma},k)$ (this action can be factored through $G_\alpha(k)=\mathrm{GL}_\alpha(k)/\mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}(k)$, where $\mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}$ is considered as a diagonal subgroup in GL_α).

Remark 5.1. For any commutative ring R, we can construct a free R-module $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma,R)$ in the same way as above. We define then an affine space

$$\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma)_R=\operatorname{Spec}S(\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma,R)^\vee)$$

over R. The scheme $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma)=\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma)_\mathbb{Z}$ is endowed with an action of the algebraic group GL_α over $\mathbb{Z}$.

Now we recall some facts about the moduli spaces of semistable representations of quivers from the paper of King [21]. Consider some $\theta\in\mathbb{Z}^I$, called further stability.

Definition 5.2. We define a slope function $\mu=\mu_\theta:\mathbb{N}^I\backslash\{0\}\to\mathbb{Q}$ by the formula

$$\mu_\theta(\alpha)=\frac{\theta\cdot\alpha}{\operatorname{ht}\alpha}.$$

Given a field k, we call a $k\Gamma$-representation V to be θ-semistable (respectively, θ-stable) if, for any nonzero proper subrepresentation $U\subset V$, we have $\mu_\theta(\dim U)\le\mu_\theta(\dim V)$ (respectively, $\mu_\theta(\dim U)<\mu_\theta(\dim V)$). A stable $k\Gamma$-representation is called absolutely stable if it stays stable after any field extension of k (semistable representations always stay semistable [35, Lemma 4.2]). We denote by $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma,k)^{ss}$ the subset of $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma,k)$ consisting of semistable representations. Denote by $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma,k)^s$ the subset of $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma,k)$ consisting of absolutely stable representations.

Remark 5.3. Stability θ is called α-generic (or α-coprime) if

$$\mu_\theta(\beta)\ne\mu_\theta(\alpha),\qquad 0<\beta<\alpha.$$

In this case all semistable points in $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma,k)$ are automatically absolutely stable.

Remark 5.4 (cf. [34, section 2.2])**.** The original definition of stability of representations [21] is slightly different from Definition 5.2. There, given an element $\theta'\in\mathbb{Z}^I$, one calls a representation V of Γ to be θ'-semistable if $\theta'\cdot\dim V=0$ and for any subrepresentation $U\subset V$, we have $\theta'\cdot\dim U\ge0$. We can relate this definition to Definition 5.2 as follows. Let $\alpha\in\mathbb{N}^I\backslash\{0\}$ and consider some stability $\theta\in\mathbb{Z}^I$ as in Definition 5.2. Let $\rho\in\mathbb{Z}^I$ be given by $\rho_i=1$, $i\in I$. Let $a=\theta\cdot\alpha$, $b=\rho\cdot\alpha=\operatorname{ht}\alpha$ and let $\theta'=a\rho-b\theta\in\mathbb{Z}^I$. Then $\theta'\cdot\alpha=0$ and for any $\beta\in\mathbb{N}^I\backslash0$, the condition $\theta'\cdot\beta\ge0$ is equivalent to

$$\frac{\theta\cdot\beta}{\operatorname{ht}\beta}\le\frac{a}{b}=\frac{\theta\cdot\alpha}{\operatorname{ht}\alpha},$$

that is to $\mu_\theta(\beta)\le\mu_\theta(\alpha)$. It follows that for representations of dimension α, the condition of θ-semistability given in Definition 5.2 is equivalent to the condition of θ'-semistability given at the beginning of this remark.

Remark 5.5. It was shown in [21] that the stability condition on $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ can be interpreted in terms of geometric invariant theory (see Section 4). Namely, for any stability θ, one constructs a character $\chi : G_\alpha \to \mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}$ by the rule

$$(g_i)_{i\in I} \mapsto \prod_{i\in I}(\det g_i)^{-\theta'_i},$$

where θ' was defined in Remark 5.4. Then the geometric points of the scheme $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ are χ-semistable (respectively, χ-stable) if and only if they are semistable (respectively, stable) according to Definition 5.2. This result was proved in [21] for R being an algebraically closed field. But the proof in [21] uses the definition of χ-semistability (respectively, χ-stability) as in Proposition 4.6 (respectively, Remark 4.9 and Proposition 4.6) and therefore works for arbitrary rings. It follows that there exist open subschemes $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma)^{ss}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma)^s$) of $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ such that their geometric points are precisely the semistable (respectively, stable) points of $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma)$. This subschemes are well behaved with respect to the base change by Corollary 4.7. For any field k, we have

$$\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma)^{ss}(k) = \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma, k)^{ss}, \qquad \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma)^s(k) = \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma, k)^s.$$

We can use the results of the previous section to construct the quotient of $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma)^{ss}$ (or $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma)^s$) by the action of G_α over an arbitrary ring R.

Definition 5.6. A $k\Gamma$-representation (V, x) is called nilpotent if there exists some $N \geq 1$ such that for any path $h_1 \dots h_N$ in Γ (i.e. $h''_i = h'_{i+1}$, $1 \leq i < N$), we have $x_{h_N} \dots x_{h_1} = 0$. Denote by $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma, k)^n$ the subset of $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma, k)$ consisting of nilpotent representations. Define also $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma, k)^{ns} = \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma, k)^n \cap \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma, k)^s$.

The action of GL_α on $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\overline{\Gamma}) = \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma) \oplus \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma)^\vee$ induces a moment map

$$\mu : \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\overline{\Gamma}) \to \mathfrak{g}_\alpha^\vee \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{gl}_\alpha^\vee$$

given by

$$(x_h)_{h\in\overline{\Gamma}} \mapsto \sum_{h\in\Gamma}[x_h, x_{\overline{h}}],$$

where $\mathfrak{gl}_\alpha = \prod_i \mathfrak{gl}_{\alpha^i}$ is a Lie algebra of GL_α, $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ is a Lie algebra of G_α, $\mathfrak{gl}_\alpha^\vee$ is identified with $\mathfrak{gl}_\alpha$ by means of the trace pairing and $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha^\vee \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{gl}_\alpha^\vee$ is identified with matrices $(\xi_i)_{i\in I}$ such that $\sum_i \operatorname{tr} \xi_i = 0$.

Lemma 5.7. *The moment map $\mu : \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\overline{\Gamma})^s \to \mathfrak{g}_\alpha^\vee$ is smooth.*

Proof. Assume first that R is an algebraically closed field. Stability condition implies that the stabilizer in G_α of any stable point is trivial. This implies that the differential of μ is surjective on tangent spaces and therefore μ is smooth at stable points. The smoothness of μ for an arbitrary field R follows now from a faithfully flat descent [11, 17.7.3]. Applying [12, Exp.2, Cor.2.2], we obtain that μ is smooth for an arbitrary noetherian ring R. □

Corollary 5.8. *If $\mu^{-1}(0)^s$ is nonempty then the map $\mu : \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\overline{\Gamma})^s \to \mathfrak{g}_\alpha^\vee$ is surjective.*

Proof. The smooth morphisms are open, so the image of the map $\mu : \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\overline{\Gamma})^s \to \mathfrak{g}_\alpha^\vee$ is open. As this image contains 0 and is stable with respect to the multiplication by scalars, it coincides with the whole $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha^\vee$. □

Lemma 5.9. *Assume that the stability θ is α-generic and that there exists some G_α-invariant element $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha^\vee(\mathbb{Q})$ with a nonempty $\mu^{-1}(\xi)^s \subset \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma)^s_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Then the map $\mu : \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\overline{\Gamma})^s_{\mathbb{Q}} \to \mathfrak{g}^\vee_{\alpha,\mathbb{Q}}$ is surjective and the varieties $\mu^{-1}(\xi)^s /\!\!/ G_\alpha$ and $\mu^{-1}(0)^s /\!\!/ G_\alpha$ represent the same element in $K_0(\mathbf{Sch}/\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$.*

Proof. In view of the last corollary, we have to prove only the second statement . Let L be a line through points 0 and ξ in the affine space $\mathfrak{g}^\vee_{\alpha,\mathbb{Q}}$. Consider the schemes $X = \mu^{-1}(L)^s$, $Y = \mu^{-1}(L)$, $\mathcal{X} = X/\!\!/G_\alpha$ and $\mathcal{Y} := Y/\!\!/G_\alpha$ over $\mathbb{Q}$. There is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d] & Y \arrow[d] & \\
\mathcal{X} \arrow[r, "p"] & \mathcal{Y} \arrow[r] & L,
\end{tikzcd}$$

where p is projective by Theorem 4.8. The composition $\mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y} \to L$ is smooth. Indeed, $\mathcal{X}$ is smooth by Luna's etale slice theorem and the differential of $\mathcal{X} \to L$ is surjective on tangent spaces as this is so for $X \to \mathcal{X} \to L$ by Lemma 5.7. Let $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}$ act on $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ by multiplication of all the matrices by scalar. This action induces the action of $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}$ on X, Y, $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$. There is also an action of $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}$ on L such that the rightmost map in the above diagram is $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}$-equivariant. The assertion of the lemma will follow from Propostion 3.13 if we show that for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ there exists $\lim_{t\to 0} tx$. The map $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}} \to \mathcal{Y}$, $t \mapsto tp(x)$ can be extended to $\mathbb{A}^1$ by $0 \mapsto 0$. Now it follows from the projectivity of p that the map $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}} \to \mathcal{X}$, $t \mapsto tx$ can also be extended to $\mathbb{A}^1 \to \mathcal{X}$. This proves the existence of the limit. $\square$

Remark 5.10. Multiplying the element ξ by some integer, we may assume that $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^\vee_\alpha(\mathbb{Z})$. Then all constructions of the above lemma can be made over $\mathbb{Z}$. Note that the formation of quotients commutes with flat base change $\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Q}$.

5.1. **Quiver varieties.** Let K be an algebraically closed field. For any $\nu \in P_+$, define an enlarged quiver Γ_* by adjoining to Γ a new vertex $*$ and ν_i arrows from $*$ to i, for each $i \in I$. Its set of vertices is $I_* = I \cup \{*\}$. For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^I$ and any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we consider the pair (α, k) as an element of $\mathbb{Z}^{I_*}$.

Let W be an I-graded vector space of dimension $(\nu_i)_{i\in I}$ and let V be an I-graded vector space of dimension α. We identify W_i with $\bigoplus_{h:*\to i} Kh$, for $i \in I$. Define

$$M(\alpha,\nu) := \mathcal{R}_{(\alpha,1)}(\overline{\Gamma}_*) = \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\overline{\Gamma}) \oplus \operatorname{Hom}_I(W,V) \oplus \operatorname{Hom}_I(V,W).$$

The elements of this space will be represented as triples (x,p,q) with elements corresponding to the above decomposition. Note that $G_{(\alpha,1)} = (\prod_{i\in I} \mathrm{GL}_{\alpha_i} \times \mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}})/\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}} \simeq \mathrm{GL}_\alpha$. Therefore the moment map can be considered as a map $\mu_* : M(\alpha,\nu) \to \mathfrak{gl}^\vee_\alpha$. It is given by the formula

$$\mu_*(x,p,q) = \mu(x) + pq,$$

where we again identify $\mathfrak{gl}^\vee_\alpha$ with $\mathfrak{gl}_\alpha$ by the trace pairing.

Let us fix a stability $\theta = (0,\dots,0,-1) \in \mathbb{Z}^{I_*}$.

Lemma 5.11. *Stability θ is $(\alpha,1)$-generic. An element $(x,p,q) \in M(\alpha,\nu)$ is stable if and only if any I-graded x-invariant subspace $V' \subset V$ such that $q(V') = 0$, is zero.*

Proof. Any element $0 < (\beta, k) < (\alpha, 1)$ is either of the form $(\beta, 0)$ with $0 < \beta \le \alpha$ or of the form $(\beta, 1)$ with $0 \le \beta < \alpha$. In the first case we have $\mu_\theta(\beta, 0) = 0 > \mu_\theta(\alpha, 1)$. In the second case we have

$$\mu_\theta(\beta, 1) = \frac{-1}{\operatorname{ht}\beta} < \frac{-1}{\operatorname{ht}\alpha} = \mu_\theta(\alpha, 1).$$

This shows that θ is $(\alpha, 1)$-generic and that a stable representation (x, p, q) of dimension $(\alpha, 1)$ does not contain nonzero subrepresentations of dimension $(\beta, 0)$. These representations correspond to I-graded x-invariant subspaces $V' \subset V$ such that $q(V') = 0$. $\square$

Definition 5.12. Define the quiver variety $\mathcal{M}(\alpha, \nu)$ to be the good quotient $\mu_*^{-1}(0)^s /\!\!/ \operatorname{GL}_\alpha$. Define $\mathcal{L}(\alpha, \nu) = \mu_*^{-1}(0)^{ns} /\!\!/ \operatorname{GL}_\alpha$.

Remark 5.13. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{L}(\alpha, \nu)$ is the preimage of zero under the projective morphism $\mu_*^{-1}(0)^s /\!\!/ \operatorname{GL}_\alpha \to \mu_*^{-1}(0) /\!\!/ \operatorname{GL}_\alpha$. It is known that an element $(x, p, q) \in M(\alpha, \nu)^s$ is nilpotent if and only if x is nilpotent and $p = 0$, see e.g. [31, Lemma 5.9] or [26, Lemma 2.22].

Let T denote the Tits form of the quiver Γ and let T_* denote the Tits form of the quiver Γ_*. As in the introduction, we define $d(\alpha, \nu) := 1 - T_*(\alpha, 1) = \alpha \cdot \nu - T(\alpha)$.

Theorem 5.14 (Nakajima [32, Section 3])**.** *The variety $\mathcal{M}(\alpha, \nu)$ is smooth and the variety $\mathcal{L}(\alpha, \nu)$ is projective. The complex manifold $\mathcal{M}(\alpha, \nu)(\mathbb{C})$ is symplectic and its subvariety $\mathcal{L}(\alpha, \nu)(\mathbb{C})$ is a Lagrangian subvariety homotopic to $\mathcal{M}(\alpha, \nu)(\mathbb{C})$. The dimension of $\mathcal{M}(\alpha, \nu)$ equals $2d(\alpha, \nu)$.*

6. HAUSEL FORMULA

In this section we give a new proof of Hausel's formula based on Hua's formula for the absolutely indecomposable representations of a quiver.

Let (Γ, I) be a finite quiver. It was shown by Kac [19] that, for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^I$, there exist polynomials $a_\alpha(\Gamma) \in \mathbb{Z}[q]$ and $m_\alpha(\Gamma) \in \mathbb{Z}[q]$ such that for any finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$, $a_\alpha(\Gamma, q)$ (respectively, $m_\alpha(\Gamma, q)$) is the number of isomorphism classes of absolutely indecomposable representations (respectively, all representations) of Γ over $\mathbb{F}_q$ of dimension α. It was proved by Kac [19] that $a_\alpha \neq 0$ if and only if α is a root of $\mathfrak{g}(\Gamma)$ (the Kac-Moody algebra associated to Γ) and $a_\alpha = 1$ if and only if α is a real root. Let us define the generating functions $a(\Gamma, q) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^I} a_\alpha(\Gamma, q) x^\alpha$ and $m(\Gamma, q) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^I} m_\alpha(\Gamma, q) x^\alpha$. Then we have [28, Lemma 5]

$$m(\Gamma, q) = \operatorname{Exp}(a(\Gamma, q)).$$

The formula of Hua (see [28, Theorem 6]) says that

$$\operatorname{Exp}\left(\frac{a(\Gamma, q)}{q - 1}\right) = r(\Gamma, q),$$

where $r(\Gamma, q) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^I} r_\alpha(\Gamma, q) x^\alpha$ and

$$r_\alpha(\Gamma, q^{-1}) = \sum_{|\tau| = \alpha} \prod_{k \ge 1} q^{T(\tau_k)} [\infty, \tau_k - \tau_{k-1}].$$

Proposition 6.1 (see [3, Proposition 2.2.1])**.** *The quiver variety $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(\alpha, \nu)$ is polynomial-count with a counting polynomial $q^{d(\alpha, \nu)} a_{(\alpha, 1)}(\Gamma_*, q)$.*

Proof. Recall that our stability is $\theta = (0, \dots, 0, -1)$. Applying the construction of Remark 5.4, we get an element $\theta' = (-1, \dots, -1, \sum \alpha_i)$. We consider it as an element of $\mathfrak{gl}_{(\alpha,1)} \simeq \mathfrak{gl}^\vee_{(\alpha,1)}$ consisting of diagonal matrices. Consider the moment map $\mu_* : \mathcal{R}_{(\alpha,1)}(\overline{\Gamma}_*) \to \mathfrak{gl}_{(\alpha,1)}$. All geometric points of $\mu_*^{-1}(\theta')$ describe irreducible (and in particular stable) representations. Indeed, let (x, p, q) be any such point and let $V' \oplus W' \subset V \oplus K$ be a nonzero proper I_*-graded subspace of dimension (β, k), stable under (x, p, q). Then $\mu_*((x, p, q)|_{V' \oplus W'}) = \theta'$ as an element of $\mathfrak{gl}(\beta, k)$. Hence

$$\theta' \cdot (\beta, k) = \theta' \cdot (\alpha, 1) = 0,$$

as the sum of the traces of any element from the image of the moment map is zero. This implies that $\mu_\theta(\beta, k) = \mu_\theta(\alpha, 1)$ which is impossible by Lemma 5.11. Hence $\mu_*^{-1}(\theta')^s = \mu_*^{-1}(\theta')$.

It was proved in [3, Proposition 2.2.1] that

$$\#(\mu_*^{-1}(\theta')(\mathbb{F}_q)/\operatorname{GL}_{(\alpha,1)}(\mathbb{F}_q)) = q^{d(\alpha,\nu)} a_{(\alpha,\nu)}(\Gamma_*, q).$$

It follows from Corollary 4.12 that the geometric quotient $\mu_*^{-1}(\theta')^s /\!\!/ \operatorname{GL}_{(\alpha,1)}$ is polynomial-count with a counting polynomial as above. Now Lemma 5.9 implies that also $\mu_*^{-1}(0)^s /\!\!/ \operatorname{GL}_{(\alpha,1)}$ is polynomial-count with the same counting polynomial. □

We denote the counting polynomial of $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(\alpha, \nu)$ by $P(\mathcal{M}, q)$.

Proposition 6.2. *The quiver variety $\mathcal{M}(\alpha, \nu)$ is pure (see Def. 3.9). Its Poincaré polynomial (of cohomologies with compact support) equals $P(\mathcal{M}, q)$.*

Proof. We have to check the conditions of Proposition 3.12 for the quiver variety $\mathcal{M} = \mu_*^{-1}(0)^s /\!\!/ \operatorname{GL}_\alpha$. We define the same action of $\mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}$ on $\mu_*^{-1}(0)^s /\!\!/ \operatorname{GL}_\alpha$ as in Lemma 5.9. The existence of the limit is proved in the same way as there. The $\mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}$-invariant part of $\mathcal{M}$ is mapped to zero under the projective morphism $p : \mu_*^{-1}(0)^s /\!\!/ \operatorname{GL}_\alpha \to \mu_*^{-1}(0) /\!\!/ \operatorname{GL}_\alpha$, as the only $\mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}$-invariant point of $\mathcal{R}_{(\alpha,1)} /\!\!/ \operatorname{GL}_\alpha$ is zero. This implies that $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}}$ is projective. □

Theorem 6.3 (Hausel formula)**.** *We have*

$$\sum_{\alpha \in Q_+} q^{-d(\alpha,\nu)} P(\mathcal{M}(\alpha, \nu), q) x^\alpha = \frac{r(\nu, q)}{r(0, q)},$$

where $r(\nu, q)$ is given by equation (3)*.*

Proof. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$a_n := \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^I} a_{(\alpha,n)}(\Gamma_*) x^\alpha, \qquad r_n := \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^I} r_{(\alpha,n)}(\Gamma_*) x^\alpha,$$

$a_* := \sum_{n \geq 0} a_n x_*^n$ and $r_* := \sum_{n \geq 0} r_n x_*^n$. Applying Hua's formula to the quiver Γ_* we get $a_*(q) = (q-1) \operatorname{Log}(r_*(q))$ and therefore

$$a_1(q) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_*} a_*(q)\big|_{x_*=0} = (q-1) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_*} \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{\mu(k)}{k} \psi_k(\log(r_*(q)))\big|_{x_*=0}$$

$$= (q-1) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_*} \log(r_*(q))\big|_{x_*=0} = (q-1) \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_*} r_*(q)}{r_*(q)}\big|_{x_*=0} = (q-1) \frac{r_1(q)}{r_0(q)}.$$

We will show in the next lemma that $r(\nu,q)=(q-1)r_1(q)$. As $r_0(q)=r(\Gamma,q)=r(0,q)$ we get

$$\sum_{\alpha\in Q_+}q^{-d(\alpha,\nu)}P(\mathcal{M}(\alpha,\nu),q)x^\alpha=\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{N}^I}a_{(\alpha,1)}(\Gamma_*,q)x^\alpha=\frac{r(\nu,q)}{r(0,q)}.$$

$\square$

Lemma 6.4. *We have*

$$\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{N}^I}r_{(\alpha,1)}(\Gamma_*,q)x^\alpha=\frac{r(\nu,q)}{q-1}.$$

Proof. Let T_* be the Tits form on $\mathbb{Z}^{I_*}$ associated to the quiver Γ_*. Then, for any $\beta\in\mathbb{Z}^I$, we have $T_*((\beta,1))=T(\beta)+1-(\nu,\beta)$ and $T_*((\beta,0))=T(\beta)$. Any partition of $(\alpha,1)$ is determined by a partition of α as there exists just one partition of 1. All these remarks imply

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{N}^I}r_{(\alpha,1)}(\Gamma_*,q)x^\alpha&=\sum_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}^I}\frac{q^{-1+(\nu,\tau_1)}}{1-q^{-1}}x^{|\tau|}\prod_{k\geq1}q^{-T(\tau_k)}\overline{[\infty,\tau_k-\tau_{k+1}]}\\&=\sum_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}^I}\frac{q^{(\nu,\tau_1)}}{q-1}x^{|\tau|}\prod_{k\geq1}q^{-T(\tau_k)}\overline{[\infty,\tau_k-\tau_{k+1}]}=\frac{r(\nu,q)}{q-1}.\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Remark 6.5. Using the Hausel formula, the first Kac conjecture can be easily proved. This was announced by Hausel in [15]. We give a brief idea of the proof. The first Kac conjecture says that, for any $\alpha\in\mathbb{Q}_+$, we have $\dim\mathfrak{g}_\alpha=a_\alpha(0)$, where $\mathfrak{g}$ is the Kac-Moody algebra associated to the quiver Γ and $a_\alpha(q)=a_\alpha(\Gamma,q)$. Equivalently, for any $\alpha\in Q_+$, we should have $\dim(U\mathfrak{g})_\alpha=m_\alpha(0)$, where $\sum m_\alpha x^\alpha=\operatorname{Exp}(\sum a_\alpha x^\alpha)$. It holds $\dim(U\mathfrak{g})_\alpha=\dim L(\nu)_{\nu-\alpha}$ for $\nu\gg0$ (this means that all coordinates of ν are large enough). From the results of Nakajima [32] it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\dim L(\nu)_{\nu-\alpha}&=\dim H_c^{\mathrm{mid}}(\mathcal{M}(\alpha,\nu),\mathbb{C})\\&=q^{-d(\alpha,\nu)}P(\mathcal{M}(\alpha,\nu),q)|_{q=0}=\left(\frac{r(\nu,0)}{r(0,0)}\right)_\alpha=(r(\nu,0)m(0))_\alpha.\end{aligned}$$

To show that $(r(\nu,0)m(0))_\alpha=m_\alpha(0)$ for $\nu\gg0$ one has to prove that $r(\nu,0)_0=1$ and $r(\nu,0)_\beta=0$ for $0<\beta\leq\alpha$ and $\nu\gg0$, which follows from equation (3).

7. COMBINATORICS OF FERMIONIC FORMS

All the generating functions of this section will be considered as elements of the ring $R=\mathbb{Q}(q)[\![x_i,y_i|i\in I]\!]$. Given a function $f\in R$, we will denote by f_α its coefficient by y^α, where $\alpha\in\mathbb{N}^I$. For any $\nu\in P$, we define a ring homomorphism $S_\nu:R\to R$ by

$$\sum f_\alpha y^\alpha\mapsto\sum q^{(\nu,\alpha)}f_\alpha y^\alpha.$$

Note that $S_\mu S_\nu=S_{\mu+\nu}$. For any $\nu\in P$, define

$$p(\nu):=\sum_{\alpha\in Q_+}[\nu,\alpha]y^\alpha.$$

Define

$$p := \sum_{\alpha\in Q_+} [\infty, \alpha] y^{\alpha}.$$

Lemma 7.1. *We have* $p(\nu) = p \cdot S_\nu \overline{p}$.

Proof. We can suppose that $\#I = 1$. Then, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$p(n) = \sum_{k\geq 0} [n, k] y^k = \operatorname{Exp}\left(\frac{1-q^{n+1}}{1-q} y\right)$$

and

$$p = \sum_{k\geq 0} [\infty, k] y^k = \operatorname{Exp}\left(\frac{y}{1-q}\right).$$

This implies

$$p \cdot S_n \overline{p} = \operatorname{Exp}\left(\frac{y}{1-q} + \frac{q^n y}{1-q^{-1}}\right) = \operatorname{Exp}\left(\frac{1-q^{n+1}}{1-q} y\right) = p(n).$$

□

Define

$$s(\nu) := \sum_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}^I} x^{|\tau|} y^{\tau_1} \prod_{k\geq 1} q^{T(\tau_k)} \big[\nu - \sum_{l=1}^{k} \tau_l, \tau_k - \tau_{k+1}\big],$$

$$s := \sum_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}^I} x^{|\tau|} y^{\tau_1} \prod_{k\geq 1} q^{T(\tau_k)} \big[\infty, \tau_k - \tau_{k+1}\big].$$

The following result is an analog of the Kleber algorithm [23]

Proposition 7.2. *For any* $\nu \in P$ *and* $\alpha \in Q_+$, *we have*

1. $s(\nu + \alpha)_\alpha = q^{T(\alpha)} x^\alpha (p(\nu) \cdot s(\nu))_\alpha$.
2. $s_\alpha = q^{T(\alpha)} x^\alpha (p \cdot s)_\alpha$.

Proof. We will only prove the first formula. For any $\alpha \in Q_+$, there is a bijection between the sets $\{\tau \in \mathcal{P}^I \mid \tau_1 = \alpha\}$ and

$$\bigcup_{0\leq\beta\leq\alpha} \{\tau \in \mathcal{P}^I \mid \tau_1 = \beta\},$$

where an element $\tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots)$ from the first set is sent to the element $(\tau_2, \tau_3, \dots)$ from the second set. This implies

$$\begin{aligned}
s(\nu)_\alpha &= \sum_{\substack{\tau\in\mathcal{P}^I\\ \tau_1=\alpha}} x^{|\tau|} \prod_{k\ge 1} q^{T(\tau_k)}\big[\nu - \sum_{l=1}^{k}\tau_l, \tau_k - \tau_{k+1}\big] \\
&= \sum_{0\le\beta\le\alpha} \sum_{\substack{\tau\in\mathcal{P}^I\\ \tau_1=\beta}} x^{\alpha+|\tau|} q^{T(\alpha)}[\nu-\alpha, \alpha-\beta] \prod_{k\ge 1} q^{T(\tau_k)}\big[\nu-\alpha-\sum_{l=1}^{k}\tau_l, \tau_k-\tau_{k+1}\big] \\
&= q^{T(\alpha)}x^\alpha \sum_{0\le\beta\le\alpha} [\nu-\alpha, \alpha-\beta] \sum_{\substack{\tau\in\mathcal{P}^I\\ \tau_1=\beta}} x^{|\tau|} \prod_{k\ge 1} q^{T(\tau_k)}\big[\nu-\alpha-\sum_{l=1}^{k}\tau_l, \tau_k-\tau_{k+1}\big] \\
&= q^{T(\alpha)}x^\alpha \sum_{0\le\beta\le\alpha} [\nu-\alpha, \alpha-\beta] s(\nu-\alpha)_\beta \\
&= q^{T(\alpha)}x^\alpha \sum_{0\le\beta\le\alpha} p(\nu-\alpha)_{\alpha-\beta} s(\nu-\alpha)_\beta = q^{T(\alpha)}x^\alpha (p(\nu-\alpha)\cdot s(\nu-\alpha))_\alpha .
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 7.3. Note that the above formulas allow us to find the coefficients of the term $x^\alpha y^\beta$ in $s(\nu)$ or in s recursively. On each step either $\beta \ne 0$ and then α decreases or $\beta = 0$ and then we use the initial values, that is the coefficients of the term y^0 in $s(\nu)$ (respectively, in s), which equal 1. This implies, in particular, that the first formula uniquely determines the functions $s(\nu)$ (with initial values as above).

The following theorem is our main combinatorial result

Theorem 7.4. *We have* $s(\nu) = s \cdot S_\nu \overline{s}$.

Proof. In view of the previous proposition and the remark after it, we just have to prove that the functions $g(\nu) := s \cdot S_\nu \overline{s}$, $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^I$ satisfy the first formula of Proposition 7.2, i.e.

$$q^{-T(\alpha)}(s \cdot S_{\nu+\alpha}\overline{s})_\alpha = x^\alpha (p(\nu)\cdot s \cdot S_\nu \overline{s})_\alpha . \tag{5}$$

The left hand side of this formula can be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned}
q^{-T(\alpha)}(s\cdot S_\alpha S_\nu \overline{s})_\alpha &= \sum_{\beta\le\alpha} q^{(\alpha,\beta)-T(\alpha)} s_{\alpha-\beta}\cdot (S_\nu\overline{s})_\beta \\
&= \sum_{\beta\le\alpha} q^{T(\beta)-T(\alpha-\beta)} s_{\alpha-\beta}\cdot (S_\nu\overline{s})_\beta .
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Consider operators on the ring R

$$T : \sum f_\alpha y^\alpha \mapsto \sum q^{T(\alpha)} f_\alpha y^\alpha, \qquad T^{-1} : \sum f_\alpha y^\alpha \mapsto \sum q^{-T(\alpha)} f_\alpha y^\alpha$$

and the ring homomorphism $X : R \to R$, $\sum f_\alpha y^\alpha \mapsto \sum x^\alpha f_\alpha y^\alpha$. Then the formula (5) in view of (6) has the form

$$\sum_{\beta\le\alpha} (T^{-1}s)_{\alpha-\beta}(TS_\nu\overline{s})_\beta = X(p(\nu)\cdot s\cdot S_\nu\overline{s})_\alpha ,$$

i.e.

$$T^{-1}s \cdot TS_\nu\overline{s} = X(p(\nu)\cdot s\cdot S_\nu\overline{s}). \tag{7}$$

It follows from Proposition 7.2 that $s = TX(p \cdot s)$ or, equivalently,

$$T^{-1}s/Xs = Xp.$$

This implies

$$T\overline{s}/X\overline{s} = \overline{T^{-1}s/Xs} = \overline{Xp} = X\overline{p}.$$

Now the formula (7) can be rewritten in the form

$$X(p \cdot S_\nu \overline{p}) = Xp(\nu).$$

But this follows from Lemma 7.1. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. For any $\nu \in P$, there is a ring homomorphism

$$\Phi_\nu : R' = \mathbb{Q}(q)[y_i | i \in I][\![x_i | i \in I]\!] \to \mathbb{Q}(q)[\![x_i | i \in I]\!]$$

given by

$$\sum f_{\alpha,\beta} x^\alpha y^\beta \mapsto \sum q^{-(\nu,\beta)} f_{\alpha,\beta} x^\alpha.$$

Note that $s(\nu)$ and s are in R' and

$$n(\nu) = \Phi_\nu(s(\nu)), \qquad r(\nu) = \overline{\Phi_\nu(s)}.$$

Hence

$$n(\nu) = \Phi_\nu(s \cdot S_\nu \overline{s}) = \Phi_\nu(s) \cdot \Phi_0(\overline{s}) = \Phi_\nu(s) \cdot \overline{\Phi_0(s)} = \overline{r(\nu)} \cdot r(0).$$

This implies $n(\nu, q^{-1}) = r(\nu, q) r(0, q^{-1})$. In particular, for $\nu \in P_+$, we obtain

$$\sum_{\alpha \in Q_+} q^{-d(\alpha,\nu)} P(\mathcal{M}(\alpha,\nu), q) x^\alpha = \frac{r(\nu,q)}{r(0,q)} = \frac{n(\nu, q^{-1})}{r(0,q) r(0,q^{-1})}.$$

□

8. FERMIONIC LUSZTIG CONJECTURE

This section is devoted to the proof of the fermionic Lusztig conjecture. Recall that, for any quiver (Γ, I), we have defined in Section 6 the polynomials $a_\alpha(q) = a_\alpha(\Gamma, q)$ and $m_\alpha(q) = m_\alpha(\Gamma, q)$ ($\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^I$) counting the absolutely stable representation (respectively, all representations) of Γ over finite fields.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We know that if Γ is of type ADE then all the roots of $\mathfrak{g}(\Gamma)$ are real and therefore

$$a(q) = \sum_{\alpha \in Q_+} a_\alpha(q) x^\alpha = \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta_+} x^\alpha$$

does not depend on q, where Δ_+ is the set of positive roots of $\mathfrak{g}(\Gamma)$. This implies

$$r(0,q) r(0,q^{-1}) = \operatorname{Exp}\left(\frac{a}{q-1}\right) \operatorname{Exp}\left(\frac{a}{q^{-1}-1}\right) = \operatorname{Exp}(-a) = \frac{1}{m},$$

where $m = \operatorname{Exp}(a) = \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta_+} (1 - x^\alpha)^{-1}$. For $\alpha \in Q_+$, we will identify $e^{-\alpha}$ with x^α. It follows from Theorem 1.2 that

$$\sum_{\alpha \in Q_+} q^{-d(\alpha,\nu)} P(\mathcal{M}(\alpha,\nu), q) e^{-\alpha} = \frac{n(\nu, q^{-1})}{r(0,q) r(0,q^{-1})} = m \sum_{\lambda \in P} n(\nu, \lambda, q) e^{\lambda - \nu}.$$

Note that $m = \sum_{\alpha\in\Delta_+}(1-x^\alpha)^{-1} = \prod_{\alpha\in\Delta_+}(1-e^{-\alpha})^{-1}$ and therefore, for any $\lambda \in P$, we have $\operatorname{ch} M(\lambda) = e^\lambda m$ (see, e.g., [20, 9.7.2]). This implies

$$m\sum_{\lambda\in P} n(\nu,\lambda,q)e^{\lambda-\nu} = e^{-\nu}\sum_{\lambda\in P} n(\nu,\lambda,q)\operatorname{ch} M(\lambda)$$

and the theorem is proved. □

References

[1] N. Bourbaki, *Lie groups and Lie algebras. Chapters 1–3*, Elements of Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.

[2] Charles Cadogan, *The Möbius function and connected graphs*, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B **11** (1971), 193–200.

[3] William Crawley-Boevey and Michel Van den Bergh, *Absolutely indecomposable representations and Kac-Moody Lie algebras*, Invent. Math. **155** (2004), no. 3, 537–559, `arXiv:math.RA/0106009`, with an appendix by Hiraku Nakajima.

[4] V. I. Danilov and A. G. Khovanskiĭ, *Newton polyhedra and an algorithm for calculating Hodge-Deligne numbers*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **50** (1986), no. 5, 925–945.

[5] Pierre Deligne, *La conjecture de Weil. I*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1974), no. 43, 273–307.

[6] ———, *La conjecture de Weil. II*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1980), no. 52, 137–252.

[7] M. Demazure and A. Grothendieck, *Schémas en groupes. I: Propriétés générales des schémas en groupes*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 151–153, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1970, Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois Marie 1962–64 (SGA 3).

[8] Eberhard Freitag and Reinhardt Kiehl, *Etale cohomology and the Weil conjecture*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, 3. Folge, vol. 13, Springer-Verlag, Berlin etc., 1988.

[9] Ezra Getzler, *Mixed Hodge structures of configuration spaces*, Preprint 96-61, Max-Planck-Institut f. Mathematik, Bonn, `arXiv:alg-geom/9510018`.

[10] A. Grothendieck, *Éléments de géométrie algébrique. III. Étude cohomologique des faisceaux cohérents*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1963), no. 11,17.

[11] ———, *Éléments de géométrie algébrique. IV. Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1964-67), no. 20,24,28,32.

[12] ———, *Revêtements étales et groupe fondamental*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 224, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1971, `arXiv:math.AG/0206203`, Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois Marie 1960–1961 (SGA 1). Augmenté de deux exposés de M. Raynaud.

[13] G. Hatayama, A. Kuniba, M. Okado, T. Takagi, and Z. Tsuboi, *Paths, crystals and fermionic formulae*, Kashiwara, M. (ed.) et al., MathPhys odyssey 2001. Integrable models and beyond, Prog. Math. Phys., vol. 23, Birkhäuser, Boston, 2002, pp. 205–272, `arXiv:math.QA/0102113`.

[14] G. Hatayama, A. Kuniba, M. Okado, T. Takagi, and Y. Yamada, *Remarks on fermionic formula*, Jing, N. (ed.) et al., Recent developments in quantum affine algebras and related topics, Contemp. Math, vol. 248, AMS, Providence, RI, 1999, pp. 243–291, `arXiv:math.QA/9812022`.

[15] Tamás Hausel, *Betti numbers of holomorphic symplectic quotients via arithmetic Fourier transform*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **103** (2006), no. 16, 6120–6124, `arXiv:math.AG/0511163`.

[16] Tamas Hausel and Fernando Rodriguez-Villegas, *Mixed hodge polynomials of character varieties*, `arXiv:math/0612668`, with an appendix by Nicholas M. Katz.

[17] David Hernandez, *The Kirillov-Reshetikhin conjecture and solutions of T-systems*, `arXiv:math.QA/0501202`.

[18] Victor Kac and Pokman Cheung, *Quantum calculus*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.

[19] Victor G. Kac, *Root systems, representations of quivers and invariant theory*, Invariant theory (Montecatini, 1982), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 996, Springer, Berlin, 1983, pp. 74–108.

[20] ———, *Infinite-dimensional Lie algebras*, third ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.

[21] A. D. King, *Moduli of representations of finite-dimensional algebras*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) **45** (1994), no. 180, 515–530.

[22] Mark Kisin and Gus Lehrer, *Eigenvalues of Frobenius and Hodge numbers*, Pure Appl. Math. Q. **2** (2006), no. 2, 497–518.

[23] Michael Kleber, *Combinatorial structure of finite-dimensional representations of Yangians: The simply-laced case*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **1997** (1997), no. 4, 187–201, `arXiv:q-alg/9611032`.

[24] H. Kraft and Ch. Riedtmann, *Geometry of representations of quivers*, Representations of algebras (Durham, 1985), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 116, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1986, pp. 109–145.

[25] G. Lusztig, *Fermionic form and Betti numbers*, `arXiv:math.QA/0005010`.

[26] G. Lusztig, *On quiver varieties*, Adv. Math. **136** (1998), no. 1, 141–182.

[27] George Lusztig, *Quiver varieties and Weyl group actions*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **50** (2000), no. 2, 461–489.

[28] Sergey Mozgovoy, *A computational criterion for the Kac conjecture*, `arXiv:math.RT/0608321`.

[29] Peter Müller, *Algebraic groups over finite fields, a quick proof of Lang's theorem*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **131** (2003), no. 2, 369–370 (electronic).

[30] D. Mumford, J. Fogarty, and F. Kirwan, *Geometric invariant theory*, third ed., Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (2) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (2)], vol. 34, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994.

[31] Hiraku Nakajima, *Instantons on ALE spaces, quiver varieties, and Kac-Moody algebras*, Duke Math. J. **76** (1994), no. 2, 365–416.

[32] ______, *Quiver varieties and Kac-Moody algebras*, Duke Math. J. **91** (1998), no. 3, 515–560.

[33] ______, *t-analogs of q-characters of Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules of quantum affine algebras*, Represent. Theory **7** (2003), 259–274, `arXiv:math.QA/0204185`.

[34] Markus Reineke, *The use of geometric and quantum group techniques for wild quivers*, Representations of finite dimensional algebras and related topics in Lie theory and geometry, Fields Inst. Commun., vol. 40, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2004, pp. 365–390, `arXiv:math.RT/0304193`.

[35] ______, *Counting rational points of quiver moduli*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2006), Art. ID 70456, 19, `arXiv:math.AG/0505389`.

[36] C.S. Seshadri, *Geometric reductivity over arbitrary base*, Adv. Math. **26** (1977), 225–274.

[37] Robert Steinberg, *On theorems of Lie-Kolchin, Borel, and Lang*, Contributions to algebra (collection of papers dedicated to Ellis Kolchin), Academic Press, New York, 1977, pp. 349–354.

[38] Oscar Zariski and Pierre Samuel, *Commutative algebra. Vol. 1*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1975, With the cooperation of I. S. Cohen, Corrected reprinting of the 1958 edition, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 28.

Department of Mathematics and Informatics, University of Wuppertal, 42119 Wuppertal, Germany.

E-mail address: `mozgov@math.uni-wuppertal.de`